

# **Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary**

Application No.

09/883,109

Applicant(s)

GASCOYNE ET AL.

Examiner

Kishor Mayekar

Art Unit

1753

## **All Participants:**

(1) Kishor Mayekar.

(2) Michael Barrett.

Status of Application: \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 21 January 2004

Time: \_\_\_\_\_

## **Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

## **Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

1-27

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

## **Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

## **Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Called the Attorney a week ago to clarify to the contradiction between the recited step of pressurizing and the disclosure in lines 7-8 of page 13 of the specification to the forming of a fluid packet after the hold-off pressure is reached. The Attorney replied today that the step of pressurizing had been claimed incorrectly and expected the 112 rejection on the matter.